



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,527	09/15/2003	Ikuya Arai	HIT 2 690-10	8024
24956	7590	04/21/2009		
MATTINGLY & MALUR, P.C. 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD SUITE 370 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER	
			KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2629		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		04/21/2009		PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/661,527	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ARAI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> SRILAKSHMI K. KUMAR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 16-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 16,17,19-22 and 24-26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 18 and 23 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/11/2008 and 2/6/09

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The following office action is in response to the request for reconsideration, filed February, 13, 2009. Claims 16-26 are pending. No claims have been amended.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 16, 17, 19-22, 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDaniel et al (US 4,415,985) in view of Burke (US 4,637,022).

As to independent claims 16, 21 and 26, McDaniel et al disclose a display apparatus (Fig. 1, item 64) to an external computer (Fig. 1, item 50) for displaying an image on a screen on the basis of video and synchronization signals from said external computer (col. 6, lines 15-25), comprising; a memory (Fig. 1, item 6, col. 3, lines 27-29, col. 4, lines 1-2); a receiver which receives a control signal to control said image, which is generated by operating an input unit of said external computer (col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, lines 10, col. 10, lines 24-39), wherein said display apparatus is configured to be separate from said external computer (Fig. 1, item 64); a control circuit which controls said image on said screen using control data included in said control signal received through said receiver and writes said control data into said memory (col. 5, lines 64-col. 6, lines 10); wherein said control circuit reads control data from said memory when said display apparatus is turned on and controls said image on said screen by using said control data read out from said memory (col. 6, lines 29-58).

McDaniel does not teach where a memory is within a display apparatus and where the display apparatus is to be separate from said external computer. Burke teaches in col. 40, lines 29-45 where the memory is in the display and is an eeprom. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a memory within the display apparatus as taught by Burke into McDaniel as the internal memory enables images to be displayed and retained by the display itself.

McDaniel et al disclose wherein said visual characteristic of said image is at least one of a display size, a display position and a brightness of said image (col. 6, lines 1-10, shown by where the display size of the characters is changed to double height).

As to dependent claims 17 and 22, limitations of claims 16 and 21, and further comprising, Burke disclose wherein said memory is made of an eeprom (col. 40, lines 29-45).

As to dependent claims 19 and 24, limitations of claims 16 and 21, and further comprising, McDaniel et al disclose wherein said input unit is a mouse (col. 10, lines 31-33).

As to dependent claims 20 and 25, limitations of claims 16 and 21, and further comprising, McDaniel et al disclose wherein said input unit is a keyboard (col. 10, lines 31-33).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 18 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With respect to claims 18 and 23, the prior art of record does not teach a means for sending an acknowledge signal indicating receipt of said control signal to said external computer.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments, see response to arguments, pages 2-3, filed February 13, 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 16-26 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of McDaniel in view of Burke (US 4,637,022).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SRILAKSHMI K. KUMAR whose telephone number is (571)272-7769. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Lefkowitz can be reached on 571 272 3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Srilakshmi K Kumar/  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2629